



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/389,842	09/02/1999	EARL LEVINE	P-2100	5948
22801	7590	10/14/2003	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			ALI, AHMEDUR R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	11
DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PP4

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/389,842

Applicant(s)

LEVINE ET AL.

Examiner

Ahmedur Ali

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/2/99 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The application has been examined. Claims 1-43 are pending in this Office Action.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The references cited in the information disclosure statement (IDS – FORM 1449), Paper No. 4 and 5, has been considered.

***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed on September 02, 1999 are objected to by the Draftsperson. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection of the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

4. Claim 25 objected to because of the following informalities: Line 2 of the claim states, "...causes the computer to embedding transaction-specific..." The line should say '...causes the computer to enable embedding transaction-specific...' Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moskowitz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,522,767 ('Moskowitz' hereinafter). With respect to claim 1, Moskowitz teach a method for tracking a requested signal (see abstract), the method comprising:

receiving a request for the requested signal, generating transaction identification data which identifies the received request, and including a pattern in the requested signal to form a watermarked signal using a predetermined basis signal, wherein the transaction identification data can be derived from the pattern; further wherein the inclusion of the basis signal in the requested signal is designed to introduce no more than a predetermined maximum level of perceptibility to the requested signal (see abstract; col. 2, lines 26-46; col. 3, lines 19-23).

7. Claim 2 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, where including comprises:

retrieving the basis signal, and including the basis signal in the requested signal

to form the watermarked signal in such a manner that the pattern is embedded in the watermarked signal and can be recognized in the watermarked signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67 to col. 3, lines 1-9).

8. Claim 3 rejected as above in rejecting claim 2, wherein including the basis signal comprises:

logically dividing the basis signal into segments, and for each segment of the basis signal, adding the segment of the basis signal to a corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which a corresponding portion of the pattern has a first logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17), and

subtracting the segment of the basis signal to the corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which the corresponding portion of the pattern has a second logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

9. Claim 4 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, further comprising:

sending the watermarked signal in response to the request for the requested signal (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

10. Claim 5 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein including comprises:

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a first logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the first logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44);

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a second logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the second logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44); and

combining the watermarked signal fragments representing the first and second logical values to form the watermarked signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

11. Claim 6 rejected as above in rejecting claim 5, wherein the watermarked signal fragments are compressed such that combining the watermarked signals fragments forms the watermarked signal in a compressed form (col. 17, lines 18-27).

12. With respect to claim 7, Moskowitz disclose a method for enabling embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal, the method comprising:

logically dividing the requested signal into segments (see col. 4, lines 6-17);

for each segment, embedding a first logical value in the segment to form a first embedded segment (see col. 4, lines 6-17);

embedding a second logical value in the segment to form a second embedded segment (see col. 4, lines 6-17); and

including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal (col. 4, lines 6-17).

13. Claim 8 rejected as above in rejecting claim 7, further comprising:

for each of the segments of the requested signal (col. 3, lines 50-59):

selecting from first and second embedded segments of the composite signal according to a corresponding bit of the transaction-specific identification data (col. 4, lines 6-17).

14. Claim 9 rejected as above in rejecting claim 8, further comprising:

combining the selected embedded segments of the composite signal to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 18, lines 18-44).

15. Claim 10 rejected as above in rejecting claim 7, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal comprises:

including the first embedded segment in a first frame, compressing the first frame to form a first compressed frame, including the second embedded segment in a second frame, compressing the second frame to form a second compressed frame, and including both the first and second compressed frames in the composite signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-27).

16. Claim 11 rejected as above in rejecting claim 10, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal further comprises: determining that the first and second compressed frames are equivalent; and including a single compressed frame in the composite signal to represent both the first and second compressed frames (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-26; col. 18, lines 1-6).

17. With respect to claim 12, Moskowitz disclose a method for embedding transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal (see col. 16, lines 39-45; col. 19, lines 57-61; Fig. 9), the method comprising:

retrieving a composite signal which includes, for each of one or more corresponding portions of the requested signal, a first marked segment which

represents a first logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal and a second marked segment which represents a second logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67 to col. 3, lines 19-23);

for each of the corresponding portions of the requested signal, selecting segments of the composite signal according to logical values of corresponding bits of the transaction-specific identification data (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67 to col. 3, lines 19-23); and

combining the selected segments to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col. 12, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

18. Claim 13 rejected as above in rejecting claim 12, wherein the first and second marked segments are compressed such that watermarked signal formed by combining the selected segments is compressed (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

19. With respect to claim 14, Moskowitz disclose a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored computer code which, when executed by a computer, causes the computer to enable tracking a requested signal by:

receiving a request for the requested signal, generating transaction identification data which identifies the received request, including a pattern in the requested signal to form a watermarked signal using a predetermined basis signal, wherein the transaction identification data can be derived from the pattern; further wherein the inclusion of the



basis signal in the requested signal is designed to introduce no more than a predetermined maximum level of perceptibility to the requested signal (col. 2, lines 26-46; col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 6, lines 42-52).

20. Claim 15 rejected as above in rejecting claim 14, where including comprises:

retrieving the basis signal, and including the basis signal in the requested signal to form the watermarked signal in such a manner that the pattern is embedded in the watermarked signal and can be recognized in the watermarked signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67 to col. 3, lines 1-9).

21. Claim 16 rejected as above in rejecting claim 15, wherein including the basis signal comprises:

logically dividing the basis signal into segments, and for each segment of the basis signal, adding the segment of the basis signal to a corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which a corresponding portion of the pattern has a first logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67; col. 4, lines 6-17); and

subtracting the segment of the basis signal to the corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which the corresponding portion of the pattern has a second logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67; col. 4, lines 6-17).

22. Claim 17 rejected as above in rejecting claim 14, wherein the computer code, when executed by the computer, further causes the computer to enable tracking a requested signal by:

sending the watermarked signal in response to the request for the requested signal (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

23. Claim 18 rejected as above in rejecting claim 14, wherein including comprises:

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a first logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the first logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44);

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a second logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the second logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44); and

combining the watermarked signal fragments representing the first and second logical values to form the watermarked signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

24. Claim 19 rejected as above in rejecting claim 18, wherein the watermarked signal fragments are compressed such that combining the watermarked signals fragments forms the watermarked signal in a compressed form (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

25. With respect to claim 20, Moskowitz disclose a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored computer code which, when executed by a computer, causes the computer to enable embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by:

logically dividing the requested signal into segments, for each segment, embedding a first logical value in the segment to form a first embedded segment, embedding a second logical value in the segment to form a second embedded segment

and including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal (col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

26. Claim 21 rejected as above in rejecting claim 20, wherein the computer code, when executed by the computer, further causes the computer to enable embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by:

for each of the segments of the requested signal, selecting from first and second embedded segments of the composite signal according to a corresponding bit of the transaction-specific identification data (see col. 3, lines 10-22, 59-62; col. 4, lines 6-17).

27. Claim 22 rejected as above in rejecting claim 21, wherein the computer code, when executed by the computer, further causes the computer to enable embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by:

combining the selected embedded segments of the composite signal to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 10, lines 18-51).

28. Claim 23 rejected as above in rejecting claim 20, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal comprises:

including the first embedded segment in a first frame, compressing the first frame to form a first compressed frame, including the second embedded segment in a second frame, compressing the second frame to form a second compressed frame, and including both the first and second compressed frames in the composite signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-27).

29. Claim 24 rejected as above in rejecting claim 23, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal further comprises:

determining that the first and second compressed frames are equivalent; and including a single compressed frame in the composite signal to represent both the first and second compressed frames (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-26; col. 18, lines 1-6).

30. With respect to claim 25, Moskowitz disclose a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored computer code which, when executed by a computer, causes the computer to enable embedding transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by:

retrieving a composite signal which includes, for each of one or more corresponding portions of the requested signal, a first marked segment which represents a first logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal and a second marked segment which represents a second logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 4, lines 6-17);

for each of the corresponding portions of the requested signal, selecting segments of the composite signal according to logical values of corresponding bits of the transaction-specific identification data (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 4, lines 6-17); and

combining the selected segments to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

31. Claim 26 rejected as above in rejecting claim 25, wherein the first and second marked segments are compressed such that watermarked signal formed by combining the selected segments is compressed (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

32. With respect to claim 27, Moskowitz disclose a computer system comprising:

a processor, a memory coupled to the processor (see col. 11, lines 21-27), and a watermarker which executes in the processor from the memory and which, when executed, enables tracking of a requested signal by:

receiving a request for the requested signal, generating transaction identification data which identifies the received request (see col. 10, lines 62-67 to col. 11, lines 21-27); and

including a pattern in the requested signal to form a watermarked signal using a predetermined basis signal, wherein the transaction identification data can be derived from the pattern; further wherein the inclusion of the basis signal in the requested signal is designed to introduce no more than a predetermined maximum level of perceptibility to the requested signal (see col. 2, lines 26-46; col. 3, lines 19-23).

33. Claim 28 rejected as above in rejecting claim 27, where including comprises:

retrieving the basis signal, and including the basis signal in the requested signal to form the watermarked signal in such a manner that the pattern is embedded in the

watermarked signal and can be recognized in the watermarked signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67 to col. 3, lines 1-9).

34. Claim 29 is rejected as above in rejecting claim 28, wherein including the basis signal comprises:

logically dividing the basis signal into segments, and for each segment of the basis signal, adding the segment of the basis signal to a corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which a corresponding portion of the pattern has a first logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17); and

subtracting the segment of the basis signal to the corresponding segment of the requested signal upon a condition in which the corresponding portion of the pattern has a second logical value (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

35. Claim 30 rejected as above in rejecting claim 27, wherein the watermark, when executed, enables tracking of a requested signal by also:

sending the watermarked signal in response to the request for the requested signal (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 6-17).

36. Claim 31 rejected as above in rejecting claim 27, wherein including comprises:

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a first logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the first logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44);

selecting watermarked signal fragments representing a second logical value for corresponding portions of the pattern which have the second logical value (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44); and

combining the watermarked signal fragments representing the first and second logical values to form the watermarked signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

37. Claim 32 rejected as above in rejecting claim 31, wherein the watermarked signal fragments are compressed such that combining the watermarked signals fragments forms the watermarked signal in a compressed form (see col. 17, lines 18-22).

38. With respect to claim 33, Moskowitz disclose a computer system comprising:  
a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, and a blank watermarker which executes in the processor from the memory and which, when executed, enables embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by (see col. 10, lines 62-67; col. 11, lines 1-27):

logically dividing the requested signal into segments, for each segment, embedding a first logical value in the segment to form a first embedded segment (see col. 4, lines 6-17);

embedding a second logical value in the segment to form a second embedded segment (see col. 4, lines 6-17); and

including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17).

39. Claim 34 rejected as above in rejecting claim 33, further comprising:  
for each of the segments of the requested signal, selecting from first and second embedded segments of the composite signal according to a corresponding bit of the transaction-specific identification data (see col. 3, lines 10-22, 59-62; col. 4, lines 6-17).

40. Claim 35 rejected as above in rejecting claim 34, wherein the blank watermark, when executed, enables embedding of transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal by also:

combining the selected embedded segments of the composite signal to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 10, lines 18-51).

41. Claim 36 rejected as above in rejecting claim 33, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal comprises:

including the first embedded segment in a first frame, compressing the first frame to form a first compressed frame, including the second embedded segment in a second frame, compressing the second frame to form a second compressed frame, and including both the first and second compressed frames in the composite signal (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-27).

42. Claim 37 rejected as above in rejecting claim 36, wherein including both the first and second embedded segments in a composite signal further comprises:

determining that the first and second compressed frames are equivalent; and including a single compressed frame in the composite signal to represent both



the first and second compressed frames (see col. 4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-26; col. 18, lines 1-6).

43. With respect to claim 38, Moskowitz disclose a computer system comprising:

a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, and a watermarker which executes in the processor from the memory and which, when executed, embeds transaction-specific identification data into a requested signal (see col. 10, lines 62-67; col. 11, lines 1-27) by:

retrieving a composite signal which includes, for each of one or more corresponding portions of the requested signal, a first marked segment which represents a first logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal and a second marked segment which represents a second logical value embedded in the corresponding portion of the requested signal (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 4, lines 6-17);

for each of the corresponding portions of the requested signal, selecting segments of the composite signal according to logical values of corresponding bits of the transaction-specific identification data (see col. 1, lines 60-64; col. 2, lines 58-67; col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 4, lines 6-17); and

combining the selected segments to form a watermarked signal which includes the transaction-specific identification data embedded therein (see col.4, lines 6-17; col. 17, lines 18-44).

44. Claim 39 rejected as above in rejecting claim 38, wherein the first and second marked segments are compressed such that watermarked signal formed by combining the selected segments is compressed (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

45. With respect to claim 40, Moskowitz disclose a computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a signal which comprises:

one or more segments of a subject signal (see col. 3, lines 50-59);

for each of the segments, a first segment instance representing a first logical value of portion of a pattern which is embedded in the segment, and a second segment instance representing a second logical value of the portion embedded in the segment (see col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-17).

46. Claim 41 rejected as above in rejecting claim 40, wherein two or more segments of the subject signal are represented in a composite frame and further wherein the composite frame includes the following frame instances:

(i) the first segment instance of a first of the two or more segments of the composite frame and the first segment instance of a second of the two or more segment of the composite frame (see col. 4, lines 1-31; col. 14, lines 26-44);

(ii) the first segment instance of the first segment of the composite frame and the second segment instance of the second segment of the composite frame (see col. 4, lines 1-31; col. 14, lines 26-44);

(iii) the second segment instance of the first segment of the composite frame and the first segment instance of the second segment of the composite frame (see col. 4, lines 1-31; col. 14, lines 26-44); and

(iv) the second segment instance of the first segment of the composite frame and the second segment instance of the second segment of the composite frame (see col. 4, lines 1-31; col. 14, lines 26-44).

47. Claim 42 rejected as above in rejecting claim 41, wherein the frame instances (i) through (iv) are compressed (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

48. Claim 43 rejected as above in rejecting claim 40, wherein the first and second segment instances or each of the segments are compressed (see col. 17, lines 18-27).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moskowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,868) disclose methods for the insertion, protection, and detection of digital watermarks in digitized data.

Moskowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,800) disclose a method and system for digital watermarking.

Brugger (U.S. Patent No. 5,636,276) discloses a device for the distribution of music information in digital form.

Allen (U.S. Patent No. 5,749,217) discloses an apparatus and method for an on demand data delivery system for the preview, selection, retrieval and reproduction at a remote location of previously recorded or programmed materials.

Saigh (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,891) discloses systems and apparatus for electronic communication and storage of time encoded information.

Saigh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,823) discloses systems and apparatus for electronic communication and storage of information.

Bloom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,194) disclose a method and data preparation and watermark insertion.


Allen (U.S. Patent 5,418,713) discloses a data delivery system for the manufacture of original content recordings at a remote location.

Miyahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,350) disclose a device and method for processing image data, transmitting medium, and recording medium.

Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,898) discloses a method and system for encoding image and audio content.

Collart (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,420) discloses system, method and article of manufacture for tracking the distribution of content electronically.

Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,783) discloses a method and apparatus for robust information coding.

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOG. CENTER 2100

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ahmedur Ali whose telephone number is 305-4667. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

ara